APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,730	02/13/2002	Randal J. Ramig	13768.243.1	8871

47973   7590   10/04/2005

WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER
PATEL, CHIRAG R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/074,730	RAMIG, RANDAL J.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chirag R. Patel	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _26 July 2005_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-11,15-19,24 and 26-28_ is/are pending in the application.

　4a) Of the above claim(s) _12-14,20-23 and 25_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some *　c)☐ None of:

　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　Paper No(s)/Mail. Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Examiner also notes that claims 12-14,

20-23, and 25 are cancelled by the applicant.

Claim Objections

Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 15 depends

on claim 14, which is a cancelled claim. Examiner, for sakes of examination, has

assumed it to depend from claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11, 16-19, 24, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Hovell et al. – hereinafter Hovell (US 2004/0093434) in view of Aziz

et al. – hereinafter Aziz (US 6,119,234).

As per claims 1, 24, and 26, Hovell discloses in a requesting computer system

that is network

connectable to a network, the requesting computer system including a native

host name resolver that is not capable of resolving a host name when the requesting

computer system is connected to the network, a method for resolving a host name,

comprising the following;

an act of requesting resolution of a host name by sending host name data in a

first protocol to the requesting computer by sending the host name data to the name

server assigned for the requesting computer, the host name data being compatible for

resolution of the host name by a DNS server, the first protocol being incompatible for

resolving host name data over a communication link connecting the requesting

computer to the network; ([0038] – [0043])

an act of monitoring a name resolution port of the requesting computer system

for receiving the host name data in the first protocol from the requesting computer;

([0038] – [0043])

an act of rerouting the host name data in the first protocol to a replacement host

name resolver in the requesting computer system; and ([0038] – [0043])

an act of sending the host name data from the replacement host name resolver

in the requesting computer system using a second to a module for resolving the host

name data; wherein the second protocol is compatible for resolving host name data

over the communication link connecting the requesting computer to the network. ([0038]

– [0043])

Hovell fails to disclose an act of assigning the requesting computer system as a

name server for the requesting computer system. Aziz discloses an act of assigning the

requesting computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system.

(Col 8 lines 26-42)   At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious

to a person of ordinary skill in the art to assign the requesting computer system as a

name server in the disclosure of Hovell. The motivation for doing do would have been

to implement a loopback (Col 8 lines 26-42)

As per claim 2, Hovell discloses discloses the method as recited in claim 1.

Hovell fails to disclose loopback address. Aziz discloses wherein the act of assigning

the requesting computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system

comprises the following: an act of utilizing a loop-back address to assign the requesting

computer system as a name server for the requesting computer system. (Col 8 lines

26-42)   At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person

of ordinary skill in the art to disclose a loopback address in the disclosure of Hovell.

The motivation for doing do would have been to allow a configuration when it is not

desirable or possible to modify a client's resolver. (Col 8 lines 26-42)

As per claim 3, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 2. Hovell fails

to disclose the act of utilizing a defined IP loop-back address. Aziz discloses wherein

the act of utilizing a loop-back address to assign the requesting computer system as a

name server for the requesting computer system comprises the following: an act of

utilizing a defined IP loop-back address to assign the requesting computer system as a

name server for the requesting computer system. (Col 8 lines 6-18)   At the time the

invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

utilize a defined IP loop-back address in the disclosure of Hovell. The motivation for

doing do would have been to allow the full resolver functionality to be implemented in

one component. (Col 8 lines 19-25)

As per claim 4, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 1. Hovell

fails to disclose the act of assigning the requesting computer system as the primary

name server. Aziz discloses wherein the act of assigning the requesting computer

system as a name server for the requesting computer system comprises the following:

an act of assigning the requesting computer system as the primary name server for the

requesting computer system. (Col 8 lines 26-42)   At the time the invention was

made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to assign the

requesting computer system as a primary name server.   in the disclosure of Hovell.

The motivation for doing do would have been to to allow the full resolver functionality to

be implemented in one component. (Col 8 lines 19-25)

As per claim 5, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 1. Hovell

fails to disclose the act of assigning the requesting computer system as a DNS server.

Aziz discloses wherein the act of assigning the requesting computer system as a name

server for the requesting computer system comprises the following: an act of assigning

the requesting computer system as a DNS server for the requesting computer system.

(Col 8 lines 26-42)   At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious

to a person of ordinary skill in the art to assign the requesting computer system as a

DNS server in the disclosure of Hovell. The motivation for doing do would have been to

to allow the full resolver functionality to be implemented in one component. (Col 8 lines

19-25)

As per claim 6, Hovell/ Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 1, and Hovell

discloses wherein the act of monitoring a name resolution port of the requesting

computer system for receiving the host name data in the first protocol resolution

comprises the following: an act of monitoring a name resolution port of the requesting

computer system that is associated with an IP network. ([0040])

As per claim 7, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 6, and Hovell

discloses wherein the act of monitoring a name resolution port of the requesting

computer system that is associated with an IP network comprises the following: an act

of monitoring port 53 of the requesting computer system. ([0040], Port 53 is inherent to

the DNS system because it is the default DNS port.)

As per claim 8, Hovell/ Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 1, and Hovell

discloses wherein the act of monitoring a name resolution port of the requesting

computer system for receiving the host name data in a host name resolution protocol

comprises the following: an act of monitoring a name resolution port for receiving host

name data in a host name resolution protocol that is compatible with an IP network.

([0038]; IP v6/v4)

As per claim 9, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 1, and Hovell

discloses wherein the act of monitoring a name resolution port for receiving the host

name data in a host name resolution protocol that is compatible with an IP network

comprises the following: act of monitoring a name resolution port for host name data

contained in one or more UDP packets. ([0060], UDP is inherent to the TCP/IP protocol

stack)

As per claim 10, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 1, and

Hovell discloses wherein the act of monitoring a name resolution port of the requesting

computer system for receiving the host name data in the first protocol comprises the

following: an act of a replacement host name resolver monitoring a name resolution port

for receiving host name data sent from a native host name resolver. ([0068])

As per claim 11, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 1, and

Hovell discloses the method as recited in claim 1, wherein the act of monitoring a name

resolution port of the requesting computer system for receiving the name data in the

first protocol comprises the following: an act of a resolving computer system monitoring

a name resolution port for receiving host name data sent from a native host name

resolver. ([0068])

As per claim 16, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 1, and Hovell discloses wherein the first protocol is DNS and the second protocol is secure DNS. ([0063]; IPSEC)

As per claim 17, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 1, and Hovell discloses wherein the act of sending the host name data from the replacement host name resolver in the requesting computer system using a second protocol to a module for resolving the host name data comprises the following:

an act of the of a replacement host name resolver rerouting the host name data to a module that was identified by entering one or more parameters in a user interface; ([0043] – [0046])

As per claim 18, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 1, further comprising: an act of providing the requesting computer system with a network address by resolving the host name data that was sent to the module. ([0043] – [0046])

As per claim 19, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 18, wherein the act of providing the requesting computer system with a network address by resolving the host name data that was sent to the module comprises the following:

providing the requesting computer system with a numerical IP address by resolving a domain name that was sent to the module. ([0043] – [0046])

As per claim 27, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 26, and

Hovell discloses wherein the one or more computer-readable media include physical

storage media. ([0082])

As per claim 28, Hovell / Aziz disclose the method as recited in claim 26, and

Hovell discloses wherein the one or more computer-readable media include system

memory. ([0083])

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hovell

(US 2004/0093434) / Aziz (US 6,119,234) in view of Onweller (5,799,016)

As per claim 15, Hovell/ Aziz discloses the method as recited in claim 1 (please

see note above under claim objections), and Hovell fails to disclose the first protocol is

UDP and the second protocol is TCP. Onweller discloses wherein the first protocol is

UDP and the second protocol is TCP. (Col 9 lines 39-62) At the time the invention was

made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to disclose the

first protocol is UDP and the second protocol is TCP in the disclosure of Hovell. The

motivation for doing do would have been to support communication with standard that

use different standards. (Col 9 lines 39-62; capable of translating between the tcp/ip,

udp/ip)

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. These references are disclosed in the Notices of References cited page and teach numerous methods of resolving host name data. A close review of these references is recommended.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chirag R. Patel whose telephone number is (571)272-7966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see

http://pairdirect.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197

(toll free).

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMI:___